

**Title I—Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards—
Part A—Improving Basic Programs
Operated by Local Educational Agencies
(CFDA No. 84.010)**

I. Legislation

Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act (20 U.S.C.6301 *et seq.*) (expires September 30, 1999).

II. Funding History

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>
1967	\$1,015,153,000	1987	\$3,453,500,000
1970	1,219,166,000	1988	3,829,600,000
1975	1,588,200,000	1989	4,026,100,000
1980	2,731,682,000	1990	4,768,258,000
1981	2,611,387,000	1991	5,557,678,000
1982	2,562,753,000	1992	6,134,240,000
1983	2,727,588,000	1993	6,125,922,000
1984	3,003,680,000	1994	6,336,000,000
1985	3,200,000,000	1995	6,698,356,000
1986	3,062,400,000	1996	6,730,348,000

III. Analysis of Program Performance

A. Goals and Objectives

The Title I—Part A program provides over \$7 billion to the nation's school districts and schools, especially in low-income communities, to improve education for children at risk of failing to achieve high standards. The program enables schools to provide extra opportunities and support that low-achieving children often need to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to master challenging curriculum and meet challenging performance standards developed for all children. Congress identified the following key objectives for the program:

- Ensure a focus on high standards for all children, including those at risk of failing to meet them;
- Provide children with an enriched and accelerated educational program;
- Promote schoolwide reform, effective instructional strategies, and challenging content;
- Significantly upgrade the quality of curriculum and instruction;
- Coordinate services with other education, health, and social service programs;
- Afford parents meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children at home and at school;

Chapter 101-2

- Distribute resources where the needs are greatest;
- Improve accountability; and
- Provide greater decisionmaking authority and flexibility to states, districts and schools in exchange for greater responsibility for student performance.

B. Strategies to Achieve the Goals

Services Supported

The 1994 reauthorization of Title I was informed by research indicating that closing the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their more advantaged peers had stalled, and that the differences were influenced in large part by varying expectations and instructional programs for students. Moreover, studies of the antecedent Chapter 1 program found that in many cases, the program was operating separately from reform efforts at the state, local, and school levels. Thus, central to the principles of the program is the premise that aligning federally supported Title I resources and policies with state and local reform will reinforce and amplify efforts to improve teaching and learning for students at risk of school failure.

Title I provides additional funds to help school systems and students who are furthest behind attain high state standards, and to support teachers and other school staff in upgrading curricula and teaching. Title I funds are allocated to districts and schools in accordance with their number of low-income children. Since the reauthorization of the program, the proportion of high-poverty schools (those with 75 percent or more students receiving free/reduced-price lunch) participating in the Title I program rose from 79 percent in 1993–94 to 93 percent in 1995–96 (V.1&2). At the same time, the proportion of low-poverty schools (those with fewer than 35 percent of students receiving free/reduced-price lunch) declined from 49 percent to 45 percent. Overall, the proportion of schools receiving Title I funds rose slightly, from 62 percent in 1993–94 to 66 percent in 1995–96.

At the school and classroom levels, challenging standards and assessments for all students are intended to raise expectations and guide other elements that support improvement, such as challenging curricula and intensive professional development. Under Title I:

- Standards approved by the state for all children become those that apply to students served by the Title I program; assessments that measure performance in relation to the standards become the yardstick for gauging the progress of Title I in districts and participating schools, and for identifying districts and schools in need of improvement.
- The inclusion of all children in appropriate assessments is intended to hold school systems accountable for all children, regardless of whether they have limited English proficiency or disabilities, or are migratory.

Full implementation of an accountability system, based on assessments aligned with state content and performance standards, is mandated for the year 2001. Until then, states are required to implement interim measures for determining progress.

Schools offer Title I services through two different options. Over the next few years, the number of schoolwide programs is expected to increase, while the number of targeted-assistance schools decreases.

- High-poverty schools (those with 50 percent or more students from low-income families) are eligible to adopt schoolwide programs to upgrade curriculum and instruction throughout the entire school, thus serving all children under Title I.
- Other schools offer targeted assistance programs, for which the new legislation encourages the use of strategies such as extended day (before- and after-school programs), extended year, and summer programs to increase learning time for a targeted group of students.

In all Title I schools, school-parent compacts, parent involvement policies, and support for training and capacity building are intended to foster and maintain cooperation between schools and parents as partners in improved learning.

Participation in Title I by Students and Schools in 1996

Number of schools receiving Title I funds	50,000–54,000
Schoolwide programs	
Number of eligible schoolwide programs	22,000
Percentage of eligible schools participating	60–65%
Number operating schoolwide programs	13,200–14,300
Targeted assistance programs	
Number of participating schools	36,800–39,700
Number of students receiving Title I services	
In schoolwide programs	5.9–6.4 million
In targeted assistance programs	3.3–3.6 million
Students enrolled in private schools	173,000*
Total	9.3–10.1 million

(V.3) *Data reported in 1995.

Strategic Initiatives

Strategic initiatives for implementing Title I are intended to support federal, state, local, and school efforts to improve education for children at risk of failing to achieve high standards. The Department is supporting full implementation of Title I through the dissemination of information and guidance on Title I implementation issues, especially on schoolwide reform and best practices for teaching children who are at risk of failure. It is working with states, school districts, and professional associations to encourage schools in their improvement efforts.

C. Program Performance—Indicators of Impact and Effectiveness

Program performance objectives and indicators, addressing the impact and effective implementation of the Title I program, are outlined below.

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
At-risk students improve achievement			
1. Student achievement in Title I schools and high-poverty schools generally will show significant improvement in core subjects.	1.1 State and local assessments. Increasing percentages of students in Title I schools will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels in state and local assessments (where in place).	1.1 State and Local Assessment Results, 1997; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Promote full implementation of Title I by disseminating information and guidance on Title I implementation issues, especially on schoolwide reform and best practices for teaching children who are at-risk of failure.Contribute to national campaigns to improve reading and math by focusing on the inclusion of high-poverty schools<ul style="list-style-type: none">Promote America Reads to encourage volunteers to extend learning in readingHelp develop and implement a plan to enable all students to become proficient in math
	1.2 NAEP reading and math. In Title I schools, especially those with high poverty, increasing percentages of 4 th graders and 8 th graders will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels of the National Assessment of Educational Progress in reading and math.	1.2 NAEP (National and state), 1997	
	1.3 Other national tests. Increasing percentages of students in Title I schools, especially those with high poverty, will improve on national tests.	1.3 Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; National tests (Stanford 9, New Standards, etc.)	
Schools and classrooms provide high quality education to improve performance			

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
2. The number of Title I schools actively working to enable students to reach high standards will increase each year.	2.1 Recognition for quality. Increasing numbers of high-poverty schools will be designated as distinguished schools by their states.	2.1 Information from Title I State Administrators, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with professional organizations, promote assistance at the school level for improved performance by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> developing an updated schoolwide idea book; holding regional conferences on schoolwide reform with the technical assistance centers; developing a listserv where schoolwide programs can share information with one another; establishing a national directory of schoolwide program schools; exploring multiple means, including electronic media, for disseminating information on effective schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.
	2.2 Standards-based. Increasing numbers of Title I schools will use high standards and linked assessments; by 2000 adoption will be universal.	2.2 ED State Implementation Survey, 1997; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998; Baseline and Follow-up Surveys of Schools, 1997	
	2.3 Research-based. The number of Title I schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction will increase annually (as evidenced by reporting they have implemented the components of targeted assistance or schoolwide programs).	2.3 Baseline and Follow-up Surveys of Schools, 1997; Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote assistance at the school level for improved performance and encourage innovation by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> working with Title I state coordinators and other partners to establish summer extended time programs;

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	2.4 Extended learning time. Increasing percentages of Title I schools will operate extended-school-year, before- and after-school, and summer programs.	2.4 Baseline and Follow-up Surveys of Schools, 1997; Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; Title I State Participation Information, 1997; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — identifying and disseminating, in collaboration with HHS, descriptions of successful extended day programs; and — developing guidance on the use of Title I funds to support extended day programs.
3. The qualifications and training for teachers and aides will reflect higher standards.	3.1 Well-qualified teachers. Increasing numbers of teachers in high-poverty schools are recognized as outstanding, through such recognition as National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification or identification as a distinguished educator.	3.1 Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; International Reading Association membership survey, 1997; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participate in cross-Department activities to promote excellent teaching, such as sponsoring a forum on excellence in teaching including the implications of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).
	3.2 Qualified teacher aides. By 2000, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — All Title I-supported instructional aides will have earned high school diplomas or GEDs within 2 years of employment (if they do not already have them or meet the statutory exemption). — Title I instructional aides will increasingly earn higher education degrees (through career ladder programs). 	3.2 Title I State Performance Report for baseline, 1997; International Reading Association membership survey, 1997; Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support best practice to recruit the most talented people into the teaching profession by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — developing materials and models for recruiting paraprofessionals, especially in urban areas, to become qualified teachers (e.g., including information on federal student aid in the paraprofessional idea book).

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	3.3 Teacher training linked to standards. The number of teachers and instructional aides in Title I schools who report that they are participating in professional development tied to state standards and designed to improve classroom instruction will increase annually.	3.3 Baseline Survey of Teachers, 1997; Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; Title II Evaluation, 1998; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	
States and districts provide a framework for improvement and effective and well-targeted support			
4. State policy, monitoring, and assistance will promote school and classroom improvements toward challenging standards.	4.1 High expectations and standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By 1997-98, states will develop rigorous performance standards in reading and math for Title I schools that are the same as those expected of all students. States will develop measures of adequate progress that are substantially more rigorous than those developed under the antecedent Chapter 1 program. 	4.1 ESEA Consolidated State Plans, 1997; ED State Implementation Survey, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help states and school districts develop and implement challenging standards for academic content and student performance and valid, reliable and inclusive assessments by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> encouraging states to share information on model standards and effective methodologies for state assessment; working with states through the consolidated planning process; and providing states with on-site technical experts in the field of assessment.
	4.2 Linked assessments. States that develop/adopt high-quality assessments linked to high standards in reading and math to measure the performance of all children use those same assessments to measure the performance of students in Title I schools.	4.2 ED State Implementation Survey, 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> finalizing and disseminating the standards, assessment and accountability guidance; and providing support on assessment issues from the ED service teams and technical assistance centers.

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	4.3 Accountability: monitoring, assistance and intervention. States and districts will effectively monitor school improvement, provide assistance, and take appropriate action for poorly performing schools.	4.3 ED State Implementation Survey, 1997; ED integrated review team monitoring, 1997 (annual); Local District Survey, 1997; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Working with national organizations, promote assistance at the school level for improved performance by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — developing written materials describing different approaches and models for establishing school support teams; — disseminating these materials through multiple sources, including the ED service teams and the technical assistance centers; — establishing a listserv for school support team members to share information on effective practices; and — convening a meeting of school support team representatives, in conjunction with the schoolwide program conferences.
Parents and schools as partners for children's learning			

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
5. Family involvement in learning will improve in Title I schools.	5.1 School-compacts. Increasing percentages of school staff and parents will report that school-parent compacts are a useful tool for enhancing communication between parents and school to improve student learning.	5.1 NCES Household Survey, 1996; Barriers to Parent Involvement Study, 1996; Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997; Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Support increased parent and family involvement through<ul style="list-style-type: none">— disseminating a school-parent compact handbook;— working with ED partners to develop strategies for increasing parent involvement; and— promoting family literacy options.
	5.2 Improved attendance and homework completion. Increasing percentages of schools will report improved student engagement as a result of parental involvement.	5.2 Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997; Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	
	5.3 Accessibility and communications. Increasing percentages of parents report that their child’s principal and teacher are accessible, communicate clearly, and involve the parents as partners in their child’s learning.	5.3 Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998	
High quality and customer-responsive federal administration			

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
6. Federal leadership, assistance and guidance will support school improvement in partnership with states and local districts.	6.1 Useful guidance. The number of state and local program coordinators who report that Title I implementation guidance is timely, understandable, and informative will increase annually.	6.1 ED Federal Implementation Study (survey of LEAs), 1996; Local District Survey, 1997; ED State Implementation Study, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support school improvement in partnership with the states by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — establishing a Title I homepage; — using a consultative process with Title I administrators in developing guidance materials; — using electronic mechanisms to respond to questions; and — using the results of district survey to design additional dissemination efforts.
	6.2 Impact on local understanding. The number of schools reporting that their staff are knowledgeable about the provisions of Title I and how to use Title I to increase student performance will increase annually.	6.2 Baseline and Follow-up Surveys of Schools, 1997; Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	
	6.3 Impact on local performance measurement. Federal technical assistance and other support to states will result in an increase in the number of local school districts with the capacity to disaggregate assessment data.	6.3 Integrated review team monitoring, 1997 (annual); ED State Implementation Study, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support school improvement in partnership with the states by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — working with state organizations; and — developing a process for sharing information on effective disaggregation techniques and through the technical assistance centers

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children			
Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.			
Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	6.4 Improved dissemination. Title I administrators and educators concerned about at-risk children will have access to high-quality, convenient information on effective practices and federal requirements.	6.4 Integrated review team monitoring, 1997 (annual); Baseline and Follow-up Surveys of Schools, 1997; Local District Survey, 1997; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a dissemination network with a single point of entry to provide clear and timely responses to inquiries from educators serving at-risk children. • Distribute information through publications widely read by administrators and teachers for at-risk children.

Preliminary findings with respect to key objectives follow. They primarily provide baseline data with which subsequent measures of the program's impact will be compared.

Objective 1: Student achievement in Title I schools and high-poverty schools generally will show significant improvement in core subjects.

Preliminary findings from state assessments

States that established standards-based assessment and accountability systems predating Title I's shift in this direction can provide the best current evidence of the impact of Title I. For example, early progress among Title I schools in Kentucky is evidenced by their gains in achieving goals for student learning established by the state. During the first testing cycle, which began in 1992, elementary Title I schools achieved 113 percent of their goal, while non-Title I schools had achieved at a higher rate, meeting 126 percent of their goal. In the second cycle, which concluded in 1996, the progress of elementary Title I schools in meeting the state's goal (129 percent), exceeded that of non-Title I elementary schools (which met 119 percent of the goal) (V.4).

Progress among Title I schools is also evident in Texas where, in 1992–93, 24 Title I schools attained the state's "recognized" status based on their performance on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS). By 1995–96, the number earning recognized status reached 875. In addition, the gap has narrowed significantly for students in grades 3 and 7 in both reading and math between economically disadvantaged students and their peers with respect to passing rates on the TAAS (V.5).

Baseline data from national assessments

Results from the *National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)* provide a baseline for tracking the progress of disadvantaged students throughout the implementation of Title I. An analysis of NAEP trends in reading found that the achievement gap between students in high-poverty schools (those with at least 75 percent of students eligible for subsidized lunch) and their more advantaged counterparts widened between 1984 and 1992. The gap for nine-year old students tested in 1984 was 20 points, and it widened to 34 points by the time the cohort of students (at age 17) was tested in 1992 (V.6).

NAEP findings illustrating the gap in achievement between students in high- and low-poverty schools are further corroborated by the *Prospects* study, which found that the achievement gap between students in high- and low-poverty schools, based on criterion-referenced scores, widened as students progressed through several grades over a three-year period (V.7).

Objective 2: The number of Title I schools actively working to enable students to reach high standards will increase each year.

Reports from principals and teachers regarding standards-based school reform efforts

Baseline surveys of principals indicate that schools serving high concentrations of poor children and implementing Title I schoolwide programs are more likely than lower-poverty schools to be implementing, to a moderate or great extent, various strategies in support of comprehensive reforms. Thirty-one percent of principals in schools with poverty rates of 50 percent or higher noted that they were implementing comprehensive reform strategies, including strategic planning, professional development linked to content, curriculum materials and technology supportive of content, adaptations for students who have learning disabilities or limited English proficiency, assessments used for accountability and school improvement, parent involvement linked to student learning, and restructuring the school day to focus on content (V.8).

Among principals in the highest poverty schools (with 75 percent or more students eligible for free or reduced price lunch), 22 percent report that all, and 54 percent report that most, of their school staff are ready to set or apply new high standards of achievement for their students. Sixteen percent of principals in the lowest poverty schools (with fewer than 35 percent of students receiving free or reduced price lunch) report that all, and 62 percent report that most, of their school staff are ready to set or apply new high standards (V.2).

Almost all teachers in high poverty schools report that they understand the concept of higher standards very well (49 percent) or somewhat well (47 percent). Teachers in the lowest poverty schools understand the concept of higher standards very well (38 percent) or somewhat well (56 percent). Thirty-eight percent of teachers in high poverty schools and 35 percent in low poverty schools report that they are very well equipped to apply standards. While 55 percent (in high poverty schools) and 56 percent (in low poverty schools) report that they are somewhat well equipped to implement standards (V.8).

Extended learning time

The baseline survey of principals found that an increasing proportion of Title I funds are being used to support extended learning opportunities. Sixty-four percent of all Title I schools use funds to support opportunities for extended learning time (during the school year). However, this is a more common strategy used in schoolwide programs (70 percent) than in targeted–assistance schools (59 percent). Thirty-seven percent of all Title I schools use funds to provide summer learning opportunities. Again, Title I funded extended learning time during the summer is more common in schoolwide programs (45 percent) than in targeted–assistance schools (30 percent) (V.2).

Objective 3: The qualifications and training for teachers and aides will reflect higher standards.

Well-qualified teachers

Data on teachers in high-poverty schools who have been certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), or recognized as distinguished educators are not yet available. However, the NBPTS reports that a very small number of the 595 teachers identified as certified by the NBPTS, had an affiliation with Title I (V.9).

Qualified teacher aides

The use of teacher aides appears to be more prevalent in high-poverty schools (most of which are served by Title I) than in low-poverty schools. In 1994, whereas 23 percent of first–graders in low-poverty schools were in reading classes with teacher aides, 44 percent of first–graders in high-poverty schools were in such classrooms. Aides also tended to work with either low-achieving students or with a mix of students in the class; rarely were they assigned to work with high-achieving students (V.10).

Teacher training linked to standards

Baseline findings from a survey of teachers indicate that those serving students in high-poverty schools were most likely to have participated in professional development training linked with high standards.

Thirty-seven percent of teachers in the highest-poverty schools (those with 75 percent or more children receiving free/reduced-price lunch) participated to a great extent in professional development aligned with standards, contrasted with 26 percent of teachers in the lowest-poverty schools (V.8).

Objective 4: State policy, monitoring, and assistance will promote school and classroom improvement toward challenging standards.

High expectations and standards

Title I requires that, by the 1997–98 school year, states must develop content and performance standards in the core subjects of reading/language arts and math. Most states have established content standards in the core subjects, but they are less far along in the development of performance standards (V.11).

The development of an accountability system based on established standards is required once the standards, along with aligned assessments, are in place—as required by the year 2000. In the interim, however, states are using measures to hold schools accountable for improvement. Under the former Chapter 1 program, most states set a minimal standard of gain. Under Title I, accountability measures are expected to be substantially more rigorous than those developed under the antecedent program. A recent analysis of accountability measures, described in state plans, indicates that states are setting specific targets either for significant growth in Title I student achievement or targets designed to reduce the gap between high- and low-achieving students (V.12).

In addition, a 50-state survey of Title I directors conducted in early 1997, found that 19 directors believe their state's accountability measures are about right, contrasted with 6 who believe their state's measures are too high, and 21 that do not yet have accountability measures (V.13).

Accountability: Monitoring, assistance, and intervention

States report implementing some changes in their Title I monitoring practices since the implementation of the new law; 42 states report that the program's monitoring procedures represent a change from what was done in the past. Half of all states note that monitoring visits are triggered by information suggesting that a local site is having trouble meeting program requirements. Monitoring visits in one-fourth of the states are triggered by information about student performance.

In addition, 80 percent of state Title I directors have hired staff who are experienced providers of technical assistance, 68 percent provide professional development for program monitors, and 44 percent send questionnaires to local districts inquiring about their technical assistance needs (V.13). This is in contrast to findings from the National Assessment of Chapter 1, which noted that state monitoring for compliance purposes, particularly associated with targeting, was most common prior to reauthorization (V.14).

State support teams

Preliminary findings indicate that all states have established school support teams that reflect a wide range of expertise and experience, but their early impact has not been measured. Among states, 80 percent of school support teams include teachers, 78 percent include principals, 74 percent include Title I coordinators, 60 percent include representatives from faculty of higher education institutions, 56 percent include retired educators, 54 percent include state government employees, and 50 percent include pupil services personnel (V.13).

Objective 5: Family involvement in learning will improve in Title I schools.*School-parent compacts*

A majority of states report that they have helped schools and districts to craft written parent involvement policies and school-parent compacts. For example, 31 states report that they have helped districts develop district-level policies, 32 report they have helped schools develop school policies, and 30 report that they have helped schools develop school-parent compacts (V.15).

Although the extent to which compacts are actually being implemented has not yet been determined, 64 percent of teachers in the highest-poverty schools report engaging in activities to promote the sharing of responsibility with parents for the academic performance of their children through compacts or other means (V.8).

Improved involvement in children's learning

Findings from a baseline survey of schools suggest that educators believe that a large number of parents in Title I elementary and middle schools do want to be involved in their children's education. For example, 76 percent of Title I principals in K-8 schools report that half or more of their parents attended an open house or back-to-school night in the past year, and 77 percent of Title I principals report that half or more of their parents attended parent-teacher conferences (V.16). Survey data also show, however, that parent involvement in school events is significantly lower among low-income parents, parents with little education, and parents of older children (V.16&17). These findings suggest that significant barriers to parent involvement exist in Title I schools, especially for certain groups of parents.

Accessibility and communications

Almost all Title I schools report giving parents information about the academic performance of the school and their children's achievement. Fifty-five percent of Title I principals surveyed nationally report that they always provide parents with information on the school's goals and instructional objectives, and 26 percent report that they frequently do. Sixty-nine percent of Title I school principals give parents information on the school's performance on standardized tests, and 14 percent report that they frequently do (V.16).

Twenty-seven percent of Title I schools that make home visits have a home-school coordinator, compared with just 9 percent of non-Title I schools, and high-poverty Title I schools are more likely to have home-school coordinators than low-poverty Title I schools (V.16).

Objective 6: Federal leadership, assistance, and guidance will support school improvement in partnership with states and local districts.*Useful guidance*

Baseline data collected from a majority of state (Title I and Goals 2000) administrators (81 percent) indicate that they found written and other guidance from the U.S. Department of Education very helpful or helpful (V.18).

Impact on local understanding

A baseline survey of districts indicates that representatives from most local districts have reasonably high levels of understanding of the new Title I provisions related to flexibility and accountability, but some provisions are understood better than others. Eighty-five percent of districts report “reasonable” or “full” understanding of schoolwide programs; 83 percent understand Title I requirements for reporting assessment results by student proficiency levels; and 69 percent of districts understand related provisions for technical assistance to low-performing schools (V.19).

At the school level, principals in Title I schoolwide programs consistently report greater levels of understanding about key provisions of the program than their counterparts in targeted–assistance schools do. Eighty-two percent of principals in schoolwide programs, compared with 57 percent in targeted–assistance schools, are familiar to a moderate or great extent with the requirement to apply high state-approved standards for all students. Eighty-three percent of schoolwide principals and 66 percent of those in targeted–assistance schools are familiar with school-parent compacts. Principals in both schoolwide programs (90 percent) and targeted–assistance schools (80 percent) report familiarity with requirements for using student performance results for school accountability and continuous improvement (V.2).

Improved dissemination

Baseline surveys at the state and local level found that state officials identify federal sources of information and assistance as very helpful in their reform efforts and implementation of federal programs (including Title I), as well as professional associations and education publications. Districts find federal sources the least helpful; they rely more heavily on state sources, professional association, and education publications (V.18).

IV. Ongoing and Planned Studies

Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the impact of the key features of the new Title I legislation on schools, classrooms, and students. The evaluation will examine a selected sample of Title I elementary schools and track the impact of key features of the new legislation, such as standards-based curriculum, and schoolwide programs, on both instructional practices and student achievement. The content areas of central importance are reading and mathematics. Annual reports will be available as of 1998. A final report is due in 2000.

Crosscutting Baseline Surveys of School Principals and Teachers. These two surveys provide baseline data on principals’ and teachers’ perceptions of systemic education reform and the extent to which reform activities are being implemented in their schools. The surveys of both principals and teachers focus on high standards for all students and alignment of curricula, instruction, textbooks, innovative technologies, and student assessment with these high standards. They also address parent involvement, information needs, and good sources of information for principals and teachers. The teachers’ survey also collects initial data about professional development. The principals’ survey specifically addresses changes in Title I since reauthorization. The reports will be available in 1997.

Follow-Up Public School Survey on Education Reform. This study will follow up a spring 1996 survey of principals to collect information on understanding and implementation of state-established content and performance standards and the Title I provisions supporting use of those standards. A report is due in 1998.

Longitudinal Survey of School Implementation of Standards-Based Reform and Title I. The national longitudinal survey of schools will examine how schools are implementing standards-driven improvements, with a particular focus on implementation of the new provisions in the Title I program supporting such improvements. The study will look at how schools use their outcome data to change classroom practice and how they measure progress continuously. The first interim report will be completed in spring 1999, followed by a second interim report in fall 1999 and a final report in 2000.

Crosscutting Study of Local Implementation of Federal Elementary/Secondary Programs. This study is analyzing districts' efforts to support the implementation of ESEA programs—particularly Title I, and Goals 2000—within the context of state and local reforms. Particular attention will be paid to program governance in addition to support for effective instruction and family/community partnerships. A final report will be completed in winter/spring 1998.

Crosscutting Study of State Implementation of Federal Elementary/Secondary Programs. This study will provide baseline data regarding the planning process and early implementation of Goals 2000 and ESEA programs, particularly Title I. The evaluation will focus on how the legislative framework and federal resources under Goals 2000 and ESEA are incorporated into the context of state school improvement efforts. The study will also address state activities, including the process of developing state plans, setting standards, and aligning assessments with higher standards in the basics and core subjects, and state support for school improvement, including the ways states provide professional development and technical assistance to districts in planning, performance accountability (including incentives and sanctions), and other supports (such as waivers) to encourage local flexibility and innovation. The report will be completed in 1997.

Crosscutting Evaluation of Federal Efforts to Assist in School Reform. This study will report data collected, from the customers' perspective, on the federal government's processes and performance in promoting improved practices, at the state, local, and school levels in implementing federally supported reform efforts. It will address congressional mandates (ESEA, Section 14701) to evaluate federal assistance to states, focusing on the role and effectiveness of the Department's communications, technical assistance, issuance of regulations, review of plans, and other efforts. Preliminary findings were reported in March 1997. A final report will be available in 1997.

Targeting and Resource Allocation Study. This study will examine how the targeting of Title I and other federal funds at the school district level has changed since the program's reauthorization in 1994, how Title I and other federal resources are allocated among various strategies for improving student achievement, and how the use of resources varies across schools and districts (e.g., by school poverty level and size of allocation).

A final report is due in January 1999.

Title I within District Targeting Study. This study examines the targeting of Title I funds at the school level, including how districts allocate Title I funds to schools, the poverty data used to determine eligibility, and exceptions made to the rules governing allocations. Special attention is being given to (1) allocations for high schools and middle schools, (2) the level of Title I funding in schoolwide

programs compared with targeted assistance schools, (3) effects of the minimum allocation rule for Title I schools, and (4) the extent to which waivers are used to provide Title I funds to schools that would not otherwise be eligible. A final report is due in October 1997.

Evaluation of Title I Services to Secondary School Students. This study will examine Title I services in secondary schools, and the extent to which the quality of teaching and learning is strengthened through the use of promising approaches and whole school reform in secondary schools. This study will inform the congressionally mandated National Assessment of Title I and evaluations of other federal education programs authorized during the 103rd Congress. In addition, by documenting Title I programs in secondary schools and identifying key elements that contribute to success, this study will provide concrete examples of exemplary practices for policymakers and district and school administrators.

Title I Performance Indicator Development and Support--Federal Priorities and Support for States. This effort includes a review of state plans, progress reports, and performance and monitoring reports, in addition to evaluative studies, to measure the extent of progress under the Title I program in accordance with selected performance indicators. In addition to using indicators identified by the program, the effort will focus on the numbers of students and schools participating, schools choosing schoolwide programs, and schools identified for improvement. The data will be routinely collected through annual state reporting, supplemented by more in-depth information compiled through program monitoring.

Barriers and Successes in Involving Title I Parents in the Education of Their Children. The study presents findings on common barriers to effective parent involvement in Title I schools. It also reports on local policies and programs that have overcome these barriers, increased parent involvement, and improved the performance of children. An ideabook for educational practitioners and policymakers will follow from the findings. A final report was completed in March 1997.

Evaluation of Title I Participation of Private School Students. The study will report on short-term trends in participation rates of private school students; patterns in the use of various service delivery options and the grade levels served; strategies used to identify eligible private school students and to select those that will receive services; consultation and coordination between school districts and private school representatives, parents of private school students, and private school administrators and teachers; strategies used to identify student learning needs and to assess student learning outcomes; use and impact of capital expense funds to serve private school students. A final report is due in winter 1998.

V. Sources of Information

1. Schools and Staffing Survey 1993-94 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, unpublished tabulations).
2. Public School Survey on Education Reform (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, publication expected in 1997).
3. U.S. Department of Education—Fiscal Year 1998 Justification of Appropriations to the Congress (Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget, 1997).

4. Unpublished memorandum regarding analysis of KIRIS assessment results in Title I schools (Lexington, KY: Kentucky Department of Education, 1997).
5. Data reported from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) (Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, 1997).
6. Secondary analysis of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, as cited in Mapping Out the National Assessment of Title I (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1996).
7. Prospects: Final Report on Student Outcomes (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1997).
8. Public School Teacher Survey on Education Reform (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, publication expected in 1997).
9. Phone conversation with staff from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1997.
10. Prospects: The Congressionally Mandated Study of Educational Growth and Opportunity, Volume 1 (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1994).
11. Annual Survey of State Assessment Directors (Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers and North Central Regional Educational Lab, publication expected in 1997).
12. Unpublished analysis of consolidated state plans for implementing federally-supported elementary/secondary programs (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1997).
13. Survey of State Implementation of Federal Elementary/Secondary Programs (Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, publication expected in 1997).
14. Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions. Final Report of the National Assessment of Chapter 1 Program (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1993).
15. Survey of State Policies and Practices Regarding Family Involvement— unpublished tabulations (Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).
16. Survey on Family and School Partnerships in Public Schools, K-8 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1996).
17. National Household Education Survey, unpublished tabulations (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1996).
18. Cross-cutting Study of Federal Implementation—Reports on Reform from the Field: District and State Survey Results (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, publication expected in 1997).
19. Memorandum to Congress Regarding Findings From the Baseline Survey of Districts (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, March 1997).

VI. Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mary Jean LeTendre, (202) 260-0826

Program Studies: Joanne Bogart, (202) 401-1958